CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

The Modern Churchman.

No. 11. FEBRUARY, 1917. Vol. VI.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

Anglo-Catholic Intolerance and the Antidote.

One of our Church weeklies recently expressed surprise that the statement should be generally believed that the Church of England authorities declined to allow Nonconformists to co-operate with Churchmen in the work of the National Mission. It would be amazing, in the face of what is constantly occurring in our Church life, if Nonconformists could believe anything else. The Anglo-Catholic party is resolved to make all religious intercourse with Nonconformists impossible on the part of Anglicans. If Anglo-Catholics decline, on grounds of principle, to have religious intercourse themselves with Nonconformists, we may not agree with their conduct, but, as lovers of freedom, we should strongly oppose any policy which compelled them to have religious intercourse with Nonconformists. On the other hand, we regard it as intolerable that Anglo-Catholics should, by a violence of protest akin to persecution, strive to compel Liberal Churchmen to abstain from religious intercourse with Nonconformists.

Nothing could have been more timely or more in order than the Rev. John Gamble's appearance, with episcopal sanction, in the pulpit of Highfield Chapel, Bristol, to which we made reference last month. Yet this action has provoked a storm in Anglo-Catholic circles in Bristol. The local branch of the English Church Union has protested against Mr. Gamble's action, and has addressed the Bishop of Bristol on the subject; angry Anglo-Catholics have attacked Mr. Gamble in the local

press; Mr. Gillson, the Vicar of St. Andrew's, Clifton, the leading Anglo-Catholic Church in Bristol, has devoted nearly four pages in his parish magazine to a criticism of Mr. Gamble's action. The Bishop of Bristol has refrained, under cross-examination, from saying that Mr. Gamble's acceptance of the Nonconformist invitation had his good-will, and merely contents himself with saying that the episcopal "action was limited to raising no objection," and that the clergyman in whose parish Highbury Chapel is situated "did not desire to offer any active opposition" to Mr. Gamble's action.

Is it surprising, under the circumstances, that Nonconformists and the British public generally should believe that the Anglican authorities are responsible for Nonconformists and Churchmen not co-operating in the National Mission?

In this connection we are heartily glad that the Dean of Durham has accepted an invitation to preach in the City Temple. The Dean is being criticised because he has not asked the permission of the Bishop of London, nor of the clergyman in whose parish the City Temple stands. Mr. Gamble, in the case of Highbury, did ask both the Bishop's and Vicar's permission, yet he did not escape a howl of protest.

We could wish that our Anglo-Catholic brethren would confine their disciplinary energy to ruling themselves without insisting upon Evangelicals and Liberals conforming to their ecclesiastical limitations. We fear, however, that argument has ceased to be effective with the extremists of this party, and even courtesy seems to be misconstrued. Without for one moment discouraging the exercise of courtesy and the proper use of argument based on Scripture, reason, history, and practical considerations, yet we confess that the most effective thing at the present time is *action*.

Because Mr. Gamble acted, because Dean Henson is going to act, we believe they are doing the greatest service to the cause of Christian love and freedom. People grow accustomed to action; in time they accept the *fait accompli*; usage establishes and confirms precedents; the most vigorous

protesters grow hoarse and dispirited as they behold their protests to be in vain. May the tribe of the Dean of Durham and of the President of the Bristol Branch of the Churchmen's Union be multiplied.*

Un Ballon d'essai.

Dr. Aurelio Palmieri, the greatest living authority on the past and present relations of the Papacy to the Orthodox and Eastern Churches, who contributed an article on this subject to the *Modern Churchman* in February, 1915, has recently stated in an American newspaper that the present Pope, in the interests of re-union, intends to re-open the question of Anglican orders. Stout Protestants will murmur regardless of quantities, *Timeo Romanos et dona ferentes*, and regard the Papal undertaking in the way in which patriotic Englishmen have viewed the German peace proposals, as a sign of conscious weakness and a device which aims at securing by intrigue what open hostility has failed to obtain. Such a view is hardly just. Undoubtedly the Papacy is losing prestige in Europe, as the Abbé Loisy has indicated. Moreover the increasing friendliness between the English and Russian nations, which is certain to be followed by closer relations between their great national Churches, will prove a serious blow in the popular mind to Papal claims. That the Roman curia should wish to check if possible such a mutual understanding between the most powerful of the opponents of its traditional claims is quite in keeping with its traditional policy, yet on the other hand it may be admitted that there is probably a genuine desire on the part of the present Pope, who is believed to be a Liberal, to secure better relations with Anglicanism, and the first step towards securing such relations would be to recognise the validity of Anglican orders. Had the Papacy recognised the validity of Anglican orders some years ago, it would certainly have

* Liberals who desire to read the *pros* and *cons*, as well as to be informed of the legality of preaching in Nonconformist pulpits as well as of the exchange of pulpits, may be referred to *Church Unity—A Criticism and a Correspondence*, edited by the late Dean Fremantle, published by Nisbet, price 1/6.—Ed. *M.C.*

strengthened National Catholicism, to-day we believe that such recognition will strengthen Roman Catholicism. It would give to the Roman party within the English Church a great accession of strength, and might enable them to bring about re-union with Rome, or if they failed and Liberalism became dominant, to migrate to Rome with the minimum of inconvenience and indignity.

If Rome is convinced of the diplomatic value of recognising Anglican orders, we may be sure that such recognition will not be withheld. Facts of history have never proved an insuperable difficulty to the Papacy. The Donation of Constantine and the Forged Decretals testify to its power to create what it needs in that line. Equally great has been its power to misinterpret or ignore historical facts which stood in the way of its policy.

That our orders are as valid as those of the Papacy has been the conviction of unbiased ecclesiastical historians, and that the Papacy will concede their validity if it suits its policy we have no reason to doubt. But valid orders, although of historical interest, and no more to be despised than an ancient pedigree, are not the *articulus aut stantis aut cadentis ecclesiae.* The only guarantee of undying vitality is the possession of the Spirit of Christ, and that Spirit bloweth where it listeth.

The Method of Pope Pacificus.

The rumoured Papal action in connection with Anglican orders raises this question:—How is the re-union of Christendom to be accomplished? No doubt many things may contribute to it, *e.g.*, the advance of humanism, the rise in the level of lay education and particularly of clerical education, but that which must help it more than anything else is the realisation of the true character of the religion of Christ. A man may realise that and still remain in the communion of the Roman Church; he may realise that and still remain in the communion of some Protestant body, but he cannot realise it

and be a schismatic in spirit, and he cannot rest in the thought of a divided and schismatic Christendom. He realises the significance of that saying of our Lord cited by St. Jerome from the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*:—

> "Never be joyful except when ye look on your brother in love."

In 1908, not long after Tyrrell's death and Loisy's excommunication, there was published by the S.P.C.K. a little book called *Pope Pacificus*. Its anonymous author was really Catholic in spirit, and his book expounded a mode of Christian re-union. It was to be accomplished by the formation of a new society, the Children of God (*I Figliuoli di Dio*) of which the Pope was the founder, and its motto, *Beati sunt pacifici, quoniam ipsi filii Dei vocabuntur.* Its object was to do the works of Christ and to develop in its members the Spirit of Christ—in short, its basis was active Christian Love. Dogmatic belief and liturgical and sacramental worship were entirely subordinated to the Christian life and the Christian spirit. Its exponents declared:—

> "*It were better* that men should not go to any place of worship at all for a year or two, and should spend the interval in doing the work of *I Figliuoli di Dio* with their whole heart, than that they should go and come away with hearts of bitterness towards those with whom they disagreed."

If the present Pope could found such a Society as Pope Pacificus founded, and inspire and direct it as he did, he might unite not only Christendom but humanity. The method of Pope Pacificus is the only method. Efforts after re-union which seek to unite directly the existing Christian communions on the basis of a uniform doctrine and organization have hopelessly broken down.

Canon Adderley's Conundrum.

Although all editors are Solomons, Canon Adderley's question asked in our correspondence pages is one of unusual difficulty. He asks:—"Are Catholics unethical?" In other words:—Do we think Catholics are unethical? For Canon Adderley holds that we have on various occasions made this charge

against them, if not directly at least indirectly. The question is not to be shirked, but inasmuch as individuals are usually either better or worse than their system, and so can be cited to defend or condemn it, we should prefer to see the question put in this form:—Is Catholicism unethical? This question cannot, without invidiousness, be answered in isolation. It ought to be answered in combination with two other questions: Is Evangelicalism unethical? Is Liberalism unethical?

The answer seems to be: Yes, all three, if held in isolation, exert very strong unethical tendencies on their adherents.

The besetting sin of Catholicism—a strongly institutional, legal and traditional form of the Christian religion—is formalism. This was the unethical feature which our Lord detected and condemned unsparingly in Jewish Pharisaism. There is no doubt that intense reverence for religious institutions and meticulous observance of religious rites does tend to develop a rigid, mechanical and exclusive spirit, and in so far as this is the case, Catholicism is unethical, in that it opposes ethical progress. All Pharisees were far from being unethical, as Mr. Herford points out in his interesting volume on Pharisaism, nevertheless Pharisaism developed an ethic of the non-progressive kind, based on "the traditions of the fathers," and so became the bitterest enemy of the Gospel of Christ.

The besetting sin of Evangelicalism is emotionalism, and that form of self-deception and moral weakness which excessive emotion is bound to produce if not accompanied by moral action. To believe that one is saved by emotion and by assent to a formula, or by faith in a transaction, is detrimental to morality.

The besetting sin of Liberalism is an intellectual and moral self-sufficiency. The Liberal is tempted to develop a temperament which is partly Sadducean, partly Greek, partly Pelagian. As a Sadducee he is tempted to limit his religious faith to that which can be proved rationally; as a Greek he is tempted to believe that knowledge or intellectual illumination is the prime means of salvation; as a Pelagian he is tempted to rely on his

own moral force rather than on the spiritual strength which is received by communion with God.

These appear to us to be the besetting temptation of the Catholic, Evangelical, and Liberal respectively, and in so far as he yields to them he becomes unethical. Moreover, it appears to us that the English clergy are more liable to succumb to the first two temptations, and the laity to the third. But whether a rigid formalism is more hostile to morality than an emotional individualism or a complacent intellectualism, we find impossible to decide. The form of teaching fitted to help a man to overcome the first temptation is to be found in the Sermon on the Mount, the antidote to the second in the Epistle of St. James, the antidote to the third in the First Epistle of St. John.

"The Shaking up of the Church."

The Archbishop of York was reported at a public meeting recently held at Sheffield as saying:—

> "The great lesson of the National Mission was that old things had become new. They were called upon to take part in the effort of a new Church in a new country. It had been said that the Mission had not gathered in many outsiders; but it should be remembered that men were not brought in unless they saw a strong, warm life within the Church. The great thing was to inaugurate a new spiritual revival within the Church—and he did not think there was any institution in the country in more need of being shaken up than the Church of England."

"The shaking up of the Church of England" is a phrase calculated to strike the popular imagination, but it is probably not meant to be interpreted very precisely. The ideal of modernity, "a new Church in a new country," ran through the Archbishop's speech, by which we have no doubt he meant "an old Church adapted by reform to meet new national needs." It is a happy augury that the Archbishop recognizes the supreme need of "a spiritual revival" accompanied by "a strong, warm life." As a French writer has said: "It is in the soul that things happen," and certainly when they have happened there, they soon begin to change all with which the soul comes into contact.

Mr. Neville Talbot's little book, *Thoughts on Religion at the Front*,* which has just been published, gives the same impression as thoughtful observers of Church life at home and abroad have received for some years past. He writes:—

> "There is, indeed, little room for complacency in a Christian, still less in an English Churchman at the Front" (p. viii.).
>
> "I may be forgiven, then, for saying that I do not think that Christianity as at present expressed and presented to men in the Church (in the widest sense of the word) is *prima facie* that which can win and possess them" (p. 30).
>
> "Right through organized Christianity of all kinds there is a great absence of the real Christian thing" (p. 36).

It is not exactly "shaking up," or even reforms, which will give us "the real Christian thing," but reforms which are the product of a new spiritual, moral, and intellectual Church life would certainly follow on the gift.

The 1917 Conference of Modern Churchmen.

With something of the spirit of Terentius Varro, the Committee of the Conference of Modern Churchmen has arranged to meet at Cambridge this year, the authorities of Girton College having kindly granted the use of their buildings for that purpose. The Oxford Conference last year, notwithstanding the war, exceeded in size the Conferences at Ripon and Rugby. The Committee does not, however, anticipate that the gathering at Cambridge will be a large one. The national strain prohibits that. Few and brief will be the holidays taken this year, and they cannot be of the ordinary kind. But there will probably be among our readers some who will find that the Conference provides such a form of rest and stimulus as they need, and who will be glad to avail themselves of it. It is mainly in their interest that the Conference Committee has acted.

With this object in view the Committee has divided the Conference into two parts. The first part will begin on Wed-

* Macmillans, 2/- net.

nesday evening, 8th August, and will conclude on Saturday evening the 11th, the second part will end on Monday morning the 13th. Separate tickets can be taken for either the first part, or for the first and the second parts together.* Clerical members will probably leave on Saturday morning, but there may be some of the laity who will be glad to remain over the week-end.

The Conference subject will be the Church. It is only second in importance to the Christ, and involves an immense number of questions of pressing importance. Ignorance of the nature and functions of the Church is the cause of many of the misunderstandings and divisions among English Christians, and we hope that the Conference may contribute something towards its dissipation.

Papers will be read on the Church's origin and development; its ministry, authority and sacraments; the function of the Church in modern social and national life; the nature and conditions of the Church's spiritual independence; the problem of the Church's divisions and their remedy. Perhaps not the least interesting and instructive of the sessions will be employed in considering the relation of the Church to Art. The rising standard of aesthetic culture demands that increasing attention should be paid to the connection between Art and Religion.

Liberal Churchmen are not regarded by some of their brethren as "good Churchmen" because Liberals cannot unreservedly accept the axioms "*ubi episcopus, ibi ecclesia*" and "*extra ecclesiam nulla salus.*" Should this coming Conference lead to a better realisation of the meaning and value of the Liberal Churchman's ideal, it will have served a good purpose.

Books dealing with the subject are so numerous that it is difficult to make a selection. Dr. John Hunter's, *The Coming Church*, Lake's *Stewardship of Faith*, Streeter's *Restatement and Reunion*, Rashdall's *Christus in Ecclesia*, are popular and suggestive volumes written from the modern standpoint.

* All applications and enquiries with reference to the Conference should be addressed to the honorary secretary, Miss Nussey, Westfield, Ilkley.

An Important Distinction.

Two Anglican clergymen have been contributing during January a series of stimulating articles to the *Christian Commonwealth*, on the great fundamentals of the Christian Religion. In their second article on *Liberty* (10th January) they make the needful and valuable, but oftentimes little recognized, distinction between dogma and doctrine. Dogma they regard as the great enemy of Christian freedom and the great barrier to Christian progress; doctrine is for them a necessary product of Christian thought and conviction, but it is best that the writers should be allowed to express themselves in their own way:—

> "There is one obstacle which hinders this advance absolutely, and must go. That is dogma. Not doctrine, which means beliefs; and no man or society can exist without beliefs. But dogma, which means a body of theological beliefs enforced as the only one which a Christian may hold. Let there be no mistake about this. It is not enough to drop some clauses of the creed, while enforcing others. It is not enough to allow some to be explained away, whilst others must be taken in their literal meaning. If the Church is to be really Christian, it must throw down those dogmatic barriers which not only exclude from it so many men of Christian life and spirit, but also include within it so many who are Christian in nothing but their creed.
>
> "Christ was no doctrinaire. He taught the Fatherhood of God, His holiness, and the coming of His Kingdom. These were vital beliefs for Him, and must remain so for all Christians. But they were not dogmas. He never made belief in them a condition of discipleship. The only tests for admission to the Kingdom of Heaven which He set set up were moral, not theological. 'Except ye turn and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.' 'He that doth not take his cross and follow after Me, is not worthy of Me.' 'Whosoever shall be ashamed of Me and My words, the Son of Man also shall be ashamed of him.' There is the true creed of the Church. There is its only possible unity—not in uniformity of belief, or of practice, but in sharing the one Spirit of Christ—the spirit of humility, of self-sacrifice, of passionate love of one's fellow-men.
>
> "But when we turn to the Church, what do we find? Creeds, confessions, articles, defining God, Christ, and the Church in terms whose formulation and enforcement have caused endless quarrels among Christians; have given rise to hatreds, anathemas, persecutions; have led to the rejection of science and history in the name of revelation; have turned the whole meaning of Christianity upside down; and have made the Church the laughing stock (better far if it were the enemy) of

the world. All that Christ said about the Pharisees has been justified by the Church. Theological orthodoxy and conventional righteousness are no possible substitutes for the true spirit of love. Love is the fulfilling of the law. The fulfilling of the law may be anything but love.

"Christ's own view on this point is perfectly clear. He said, 'Repent,' as the Baptist did. He said, 'Love God and your neighbour.' He said, 'Become as little children.' He said, 'Take up your cross and follow me.' But he never said, 'Believe this, or believe that, or I will not admit you to my society.'"

An Urgent Need and how to meet it.

Where are the Broad Church laity? is a question which is often asked by our opponents, but without the note of regret in Villon's *Mais où sont les neiges d'antan?* Obviously, with few exceptions, the Broad Church laity are not in their pews. Moreover, as a body, they have altered in type and personnel. A recent writer has put the question and answered it thus:—

> "Where is the body of lay opinion which stood behind Maurice, Stanley, and Jowett? The acute medievalising of Anglicanism is unfavourable to the growth of Churchmanship of this quality: those who would naturally have represented it in a later generation have been alienated, and gone off, some into undenominationalism, some into secularism, while others identify themselves more or less nominally with a convention which, in dropping its intellectual content, has lost its moral force. And now the ranks of the *intellectuals* are recruited by a mixed multitude from the high schools, the technical and training colleges, and the new universities; willing, often, to believe, but impatient of traditional belief and formula; needing religion, but repelled by its temper and form."

The problem which is for ever pressing upon earnest Broad Churchmen is:—How are these alienated brethren to be won back? The Broad Church preacher realises that preaching cannot do it in most cases because the alienated Broad Churchmen are not there to listen to it. It may be done by meetings and speeches, and in private conversation, but, above all, it must be done by literature. In this connection a number of active members of the Churchmen's Union have asked repeatedly for cheap and popular manuals written by Broad Churchmen, dealing with the Broad Churchman's ideals,

explaining his creed and why he holds it. Why he continues to be a Churchman, and what necessary purpose he believes the Church to serve in individual, social, and national life? How he views the Bible, and why he studies and uses it? What is his view of the sacraments and why he shares in them?

A Publications' Committee appointed by the Council of the Churchmen's Union is now acting in this matter, and if the necessary financial support is forthcoming, manuals intended to meet this urgent need will soon be ready for the press.[1]

The Council of the Churchmen's Union, while well aware of the stringent demand for money to assist our nation in its great struggle, yet feels that it may appeal to Liberal Churchmen on behalf of this urgent moral and spiritual need. But we wish to be quite clear as to the nature of our appeal. What we desire is not money to be paid out in this time of stress, but guarantees which will not in any case be called up before the 30th of June.[2]

We hope, therefore, that it will not be felt that such an appeal at such a time is ill-judged and unpatriotic. As Christian Englishmen our feeling is expressed by two sentences from Oliver Cromwell's letters and speeches. In 1635 he wrote in a letter to a friend asking for pecuniary support for a religious lectureship:—

> "Building of hospitals provides for men's bodies; to build material temples is judged a work of piety; but they that procure spiritual food, they that build up spiritual temples, they are the men truly charitable, truly pious."

The other side, he expressed on another occasion thus:—

> "Besides, if any whosoever think the interests of Christians and the interest of the nation inconsistent, I wish my soul may never enter into their secrets."

---

[1] They will be small in size, but printed in good type, and their price will be a shilling each. They will be published under the supervision of the editor of the *Modern Churchman* co-operating with a small committee.

[2] At least £300 is required, £200 of it in £10 guarantees, and the rest in smaller sums. Mrs. Reith, Summerfield, Ilkley, is the honorary treasurer of the fund, and Mr. Bagenal's letter in this month's issue extends the period of his generous offer to the 31st of March.

"IS THE CHURCH WORTH PRESERVING?"

By the Rev. J. R. Cohu, M.A., Rector of Aston Clinton,
sometime Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford.

None too soon is the Church bestirring herself. Challenged from within and without, she has trying days ahead. Within, though her party-feuds *seem* lulled, she is as a house divided against itself. Already, in one quarter, we see clear signs of active mobilisation for the coming fray, and of a "call to revolt" if a recent ultimatum is not accepted. Without her borders, men are asking: "Is the Church worth preserving? As a national asset, does she count as a power for good in the land?" For men to-day are in deadly earnest. In this national, European, upheaval, men and institutions are being weighed in the balances, and, if found wanting, big reputations do not save them from being scrapped. So with the Church. She must show that here and now she is strong and alive, claiming men's loyal allegiance, not for her past services, but for her present worth and vitality. Vitality has been well defined as "adaptabity to new environment," and if a Church remains stationary in a moving world, fails to grow with men's growth, she ceases to count. To-day men are openly asking: Is the Church abreast of our intellectual, moral and social life, voicing the intelligence, conscience, aspirations of the nation, able to transmute these into intelligent and practical forms for the regeneration of England's life? As the nation's spiritual caterer, does she feed men's souls with food wholesome for Englishmen now, or does she present God's Truth in words and ideas so obsolete that her message no longer touches the heart and conscience or elevates and feeds men's souls? As England's conscience, does she protest against and combat our moral sores and social wrongs, or passively acquiesce in them? As the preacher of "peace and goodwill toward men," what has she done to promote brotherhood between man and

man, class and class, nation and nation? In her own dealings with other Christian Churches in the land, is she holding out the right hand of fellowship, or is she Pharisaical, intractable, tart to other Protestant bodies? New social forces are at work for the making or marring of England; is she doing all she can to change the socialism based on clashing interests into the socialism based on the sense of spiritual union for the common good; or is there truth in the working man's plea that she is always on the side of property and the squire?

Men openly ask these questions, and insist on an answer. The answer is not always or often flattering. "Is the Anglican Church worth preserving?" asks the Bishop of Oxford. So do crowds of others, and their answer is even more qualified than his. In many eyes, she is only a picturesque "survival," *magni nominis umbra*, not a real, strong, going concern providing what men cannot possibly do without; *i.e.*, the Church is a failure. They readily admit that never was there among the clergy more zeal and energy, a higher standard of life and duty, but imply that, for lack of vision, this fine motive-power is being directed into wrong channels, back-waters, ritual side-issues as trivial as "the tithing of mint, anise, and cummin; omitting weightier matters of judgment, mercy, and faith." Hence our empty churches, because of their unreality and failure to gauge our English psychology. "*Si l'église ne marche pas dans le sens de la vie, la vie la repousse.*"

. . . . .

These are home-truths, and at our peril do we ignore their challenge to set our house in order. And this we have to do with an eye to the "health and wealth" of the Englishmen,—not Latins or Slavs,—who are to dwell in it. Psychologically nations differ as radically as individuals. A Paul and a James and their churches too, alike held "the faith once delivered to the saints." But each apostle cast it into his own mould of thought, moulds so distinct that the two parted and agreed to differ even on what each considered "essential" truths. Our

Church, even as our Constitution, has grown with our growth, and registers and reflects our character, slow but practical, independent but tolerant, full of commonsense but without much feeling for logic or art, lovers of the truth and the right as we see it but with no eye for distant ideals. In her Reformation Settlement, just because it is so comprehensive and full of compromises, a strong and living Church, with a hand on the pulse of the nation, gave us what exactly suited and reflected England then. But it bears now upon its face the stamp of its sixteenth century birth, and is waxing old.[1] It is for us to-day to catch the spirit of our Reformers four hundred years ago, continue their work on their lines, and do it as bravely.

On the vital need of Reform all are agreed, but Churchmen are at each other's throats over the ways and means. Here they split into two rival camps. We may roughly label them the "prophetic" and "priestly" schools, though there is no "open vision" to-day. Priests we have plenty, prophets none. To avoid misconception, let us broadly define the terms. The "priestly" school holds that the hierarchy of the Church is "the divinely appointed channel through which the Holy Spirit speaks and acts," and questions the validity of any other ministry. The "prophetic" school holds that the Spirit bloweth where it listeth, and,—pointing to the God-blessed ministry of prophets and others, in Biblical and modern times, men ordained of God and not of man, who with their converts "received the Holy Ghost as well as we,"—it refuses to tie down the Holy Spirit to any men, rites, or institutions as its channels of grace. It remembers, what the other school forgets, that, up to 100 A.D., unordained, or rather God-ordained, prophets were the rule and bishops and clergy, in our sense, the exception :—

> "Appoint for yourselves bishops and deacons . . . . for unto you they perform the service of the prophets and apostles. Therefore

[1] *cf.* Wm. James: "The theological machinery that spoke so livingly to our ancestors, with its finite age of the world, its creation out of nothing, its juridical morality and eschatology, its relish for rewards and punishments, its treatment of God as an external contriver, sounds as odd to most of us as if it were some outlandish rude religion."

despise them not; for they are your honorable men along with the prophets and teachers" (*Didache*).

The "prophetic" school faces the present crisis in the nation and Church as Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Christ Himself, faced a very similar situation in their day. The parallel is striking. Then, as now, there was much religiosity and little religion. Communion with God was to be only through certain holy persons, at certain holy places, according to certain holy rites. A regularly organised body of men, viewed as Jehovah's official representatives, "ministered for men in things pertaining to God" as His divinely appointed organs and channels of grace to His chosen people. They were earnest and respected men, a highly-privileged professional caste, over-apt to magnify their office after the manner of a traditional state religion out of which much of the quickening life and spirit have gone. They had ceased to be rebukers of wrong and awakeners of the national conscience, and were now mainly teachers and champions of the traditional orthodoxy and conventional moral code, laying all the stress on a routine of services, ritual, sacrifices to which they attributed magical efficacy; all the while shutting their eyes to glaring national sins. All that God required was a due performance of the proper sacrifices and services. If it was desired, in times of trouble, to draw still closer the bond of union between God and His people, all that was needed was to redouble these services and sacrifices.

As a bolt from the blue falls an Amos or an Isaiah or a Christ upon these self-satisfied priests and worshippers, and boldly denounces to their faces their ceremonial Sabbaths and solemn meetings and prayers and sacrifices as an abomination to the Lord, mere lip-service, insisting that God demands a right life, not mere orthodoxy or correct services and sacrifices (Is. i. 11-18). Our Lord says exactly the same thing: "Not everyone that saith unto Me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father in heaven;" even as, in St. Matt. xxv. 34-46, He assures us that, not orthodoxy, but a warm heart going out of self in ministering love to others will be His test of us at the last day.

This brings us to the first reform that the "prophetic" school want to see in our Church to-day. Hitherto we have identified religion overmuch with an endless routine of services and sacrifices; we want it to mean "the love of Christ constraining us" to uprightness of character and a life spent in the service of man.[1] The life-work is what God looks for above all else. "By their fruits ye shall know them" that are mine. And the Church will never be the power God means her to be in the land, nor will she be the nation's conscience, till she gets the "Christ tonch," and preaches the Gospel of the Love of God shown in the service of Man.

A second lesson our Church needs to take to heart is the counsel of the Lambeth Encyclical (1908):—

> "We are bound by our principles to look with confidence and hope on the progress of Modern Thought. It is our duty to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints, which is the secret of life. And at the same time it is our duty to learn all that God is teaching through the studies and discoveries of our contemporaries,—discerning indeed the spirits, whether they be of God, but bending with reverent teachableness to the influence of His Spirit from whatever quarter He may breathe upon us."

Our Church in her theology has an eternal message to living men to-day; but she presents it in a form and wording far removed from the ideas and culture of our day, so it appeals to us little or not at all. Disburden this obsolete theology of its dead values, restate it by the light God is pouring on us to-day, then the message will again become fresh and real, God's message to us.[2]

A strong plank in this school's platform is a hearty co-operation with all who call themselves Christians. Endorsing the Bidding Prayer's definition of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, "that is, the whole congregation of Christian people throughout the whole world," it dares not call the God-blessed ministry of

[1] At the front there are only two sides to religious experience: the realisation of what the Presence of God means, and the fulfilment of the plain, simple duty of the moment. The forms and ceremonies are not forgotten, but they have sunk so far into the background that very many of them have no longer an inspired meaning at all."—The Jewish Soldiers' religion, *Jewish Chronicle*, December 9th, 1916.

[2] If this were done, many conscientious Christian men of strong moral and religious convictions and exceptional ability would not keep aloof from the ministry as they do now. Not all can subscribe to formularies they do not fully endorse.

the Free Churches invalid, and prays for reunion with them.[1] Of many other reforms, *e.g.*, simplified Church services; giving the laity some voice in the appointment of parish clergy, and better representation in the Church's councils; a less narrowing and more practical training of ordinands than our intensely ecclesiastical theological colleges supply, so that they may be large-minded Christians in full touch with our social and educational needs;—of these and many other reforms we cannot here speak.

One reform strongly advocated by many Churchmen to-day, this school does *not* endorse, viz., Disestablishment, and for these reasons. The coupling of Church and State confers a Christian character upon the State and does make for its religious welfare. It also gives to every subject of the King a right to the ministrations of the clergy.[2] Moreover, it greatly benefits the Church, and safeguards one of her great assets won for her by the Reformation settlement, her breadth and comprehensiveness. This enables her to gather to her bosom men of a wide variety of thought, groups of Churchmen facing truth from different aspects, yet equally loyal to her leading principles; while securing for them a freedom of thought and utterance which broadens the outlook both of Church and nation. Disestablish the Church and this comprehensiveness goes, eventually narrowing her into a sect as unimportant as the Episcopal Church in the United States; for, on their own showing, the Anglo-Catholics would soon give short shrift to those who did not fall into line with themselves.

. . . . . .

The Anglo-Catholic body, by far the largest and best organised party of our Church, approaches Church Reform

[1] *cf. The Jewish Soldier's Religion*, sermon by Rev. V. G. Simmons, at the West London Synagogue, Dec. 9th, 1916: "Just think of it! a Church of England Service, in a Roman Catholic Chapel, with many Nonconformist worshippers, and the sermon preached by a Jew. Again, a young Jewish nurse in a hospital discovered that the mortuary was neglected. She obtained from England a crucifix and an altar-cloth, and makes it her daily duty to see the place clean and beautiful with flowers."

[2] *e.g.* Many clergy now refuse to allow the congregation to make their Communions at the mid-day Eucharist. By the first rubric of our Communion Service, any parishioner, not 'an open and notorious evil liver,' signifying his intention to partake of the Holy Communion to the Incumbent some time the day before, has the right to do so, and no one can deny him.

from a totally different point of view, the priestly or sacerdotal standpoint. Reverence in worship, parochial conscientiousness, and intense realisation of the sacramental Presence of Christ are Anglo-Catholic notes. A deeper study of the Fathers than of St. Paul enables this school to identify Church-tradition from 100 A.D. to the eve of the Reformation with "the faith once and for all delivered to the saints." The Reformation, and all similar attempts, it brands as ungodly tampering with the sacred deposit of revealed truth; still worse, since the Reformation, the Anglican Church is cut off from the Holy Catholic Church, in schism. A glance at some of the Anglo-Catholic Articles of Faith is essential to the understanding of Anglo-Catholic proposed reforms:—

The Church is God's, not man's, creation. Christ founded it. He is its Head, it is His Body, His living organ for His work on earth. Incarnate in His Church, its acts and government are His own. Its ministers He instituted for all time (St. Matt. xxviii. 20), setting over it first St. Peter and the Apostles, then the bishops their successors in unbroken line and heirs of their authority and privileges. For this government of His Church He equipped them with a vast jurisdiction, the power of "binding and loosing," pledging Himself to endorse their laws and decisions, their use of the spiritual sword, for the health and wealth of His Church. Thus Christ means His Church to be self-governing, and no State has power over the government of the Church. All members of the Church are bound to obey its laws, and the bishops must enforce them.

The Church is no mere invisible "congregation of the faithful" whose members God only knows; it is a visible and organised society, as visible as any earthly kingdom, to which one belongs, as to any other society, by an external tie, the act of baptism. In the Church, from the outset, are clergy and laity, the one teaching and governing, the other taught and governed. The hierarchical ministry is divinely appointed and threefold, bishops, priests, deacons. The bishop is of the *esse*, not only *bene esse*, of the Church. No bishop, no Church.

He is the indispensable channel of God's grace, the indispensable bond of the Church's continuity. Not to be in communion with the bishop is not to be in the Church. The unity of the Church is guaranted by the communion of the bishops with one another.[1] The priests are sacrificing and absolving priests. Deacons are assistant ministers. There are, "as reckoned in the greater part of the Catholic Church," seven sacraments: Baptism, Holy Communion, Confirmation, Penance, Holy Matrimony, Holy Orders, Unction of the Sick. Outside the Church, no sacrament is "valid." The Church gave the Scriptures, not the Scriptures the Church, and is their best interpreter.[2] There is only one Church of Christ, and it can have no "sister" churches. All who withdraw from it *ipso facto* apostatise from Christ, and outside the Church is no salvation. Providing a separate Church for each nation is schism.

. . . . .

Naturally, the Anglo-Catholic plan of Church reform is simple and drastic. As the Church of Christ, equipped by Him with plenary powers, the Church is, and must be self-governing; to allow interference in its self-government by the State is high treason to Christ, its one Head, and fatal to the welfare of the Church.

As a separate national Church, our Church is in schism since Reformation days. This sin must be cast away. The Anglican Church must fall into line with the one Holy Catholic Church either of the Roman or Greek communion. Rome, as the see of St. Peter, has the bluer blood, but when approached by us she superciliously repudiated our Anglican orders, branding even our bishops as heretics and laymen. Rome is not necessarily the whole Church. The Greek Church is too great to be ignored, and is ready to receive us into her communion. All that is needed is the full assertion on our

[1] See C. Gore's *Manual of Membership*, p. 71.

[2] *cf.* Rev. A. H. Baverstock, *Church Times*, Dec. 15th, 1916, p. 525: "Holy Scripture is to be interpreted according to the sense of the ancient Fathers, is the injunction of the English Church."

part of our Catholic sacraments and articles of faith as handed down in the undivided Church for 1550 years. The Anglican Church, at whatever cost, must recover her divine right of self-government through her bishops, restore the ancient "tradition" fully, and enforce unquestioning obedience to its rules. The bishops have plenary powers of "binding and loosing." As legislators, they can make new canons and rules to suit our present needs. But they must also wield fearlessly the spiritual sword, exercise the power of enforcing discipline and implicit obedience to ecclesiastical law. Those who refuse to obey must be summarily dealt with. Better a small Church of real Christians than a large one of nominal Christians.

. . . . .

Self-government of the Church by a central Board of Bishops with large driving power; full use by the bishops of their legislative and disciplinary jurisdiction as vested in them by their divine right of "binding and loosing;" unquestioning obedience to their rulings on the part of all Churchmen, priests, and laity alike, on pain of excommunication; restoring the sacrifice of the Mass, and Penance, to their rightful place; reunion with the one Holy Catholic Church,—these are some of the urgent reforms insisted on by Anglo-Catholics; and they mean to have them or leave "an Anglican Church then not worth preserving."

The Church is for the nation, not the nation for the Church. It is for England to say whether this autocratic episcopate wholly independent of the State, this large extension of sacerdotalism, with its Eastern Church tendency and narrow exclusiveness,—for Liberal Churchmen and Evangelicals are already earmarked for notice to quit,—is in line with our English ideas and character. We need only add one note: a glance at Lightfoot's *Ministry of the Church*, or Hatch's *Bampton Lectures*, or Gwatkin's *Early Church History*, will soon show that the Anglo-Catholic views of a supernatural Church, Apostolic Succession, and a sacrificial priesthood, are monstrous historic fictions.

FAILURE OR FLAME?

By the Rev. E. W. Winstanley, D.D.

The other day I was thinking about "The National Mission and Worship," which happened to be the subject for one of a course of addresses given in a parish church in preparation for that spiritual effort. My thoughts wandered to the acts of worship in and behind the trenches, to the religion, for the most part inarticulate, of our lads at the front; then my mind returned to the worship of our present day institutional religion, whether Catholic or Protestant in type, ornate in ritual, or austere in service. And I reflected that in either case, whatever the public and official or the military formalism of worship, comparatively few people truly pray, only a minority let their religion or devotion come to expression, or indeed are capable of so doing. Saddened by this reflexion, and constrained to admit with sorrow that our theoretically "national" Church only retains the loyalty of a minority of the citizens, and is tending to become increasingly sectarian, and in danger of being controlled by a vigorous but short-sighted school of earnest men, obsessed by an admiration for "Western" doctrine and ceremonial, I reverted in my meditation to the first age, and the corporate and unselfish enthusiasm of early Christianity.

And then I realised with some suddenness wherein lay the likeness of the devotion raised to the height of religion, which is exhibited both in our lines and in those of our Allies, to that unflinching resolution and fearlessness of the primitive Church, and I found it to be in the *reality* common to both. In the trenches an unfailing, a self-surrendering loyalty to cause, to country, to comradeship, to discipline, dominates all, and infuses a spirit of readiness to suffer and to sympathise, to do deeds of apparently impossible heroism, to face cheerfully, nay, buoyantly, wounds and mutilation, and to smile in the face of

violent death. More than the subaltern, the commander-in-chief, the monarch, it is country and cause, or indeed Right personified that inspires all with one disposition of unselfish sacrifice, although our men might find it hard to define the fact in words.

This present dominance of cause and comradeship proves to be parallel to, and comparable with, the Lordship of Christ and the fellowship of Christians, which welded the indigent and slave congregations of the Roman Empire into a self-conscious whole, a "new race," a world-wide "ecclesia." Nor was their position wholly unlike that of our heroes before the embattled lines of our foes. For consider. The crude, cheery, outwardly blasphemous yet essentially unexpressed faith of the soldiers, issuing in deeds of almost unexampled valour day by day, is inwardly and fundamentally religious. Honour, trust, sympathy, unselfishness; all these are discoverable there in good measure, although the men may never consciously associate these definitely Christian virtues with the Founder or with the Churches that bear His name, and to which on enlistment they reported themselves as belonging. It is well to remember that religion thus latent or inarticulate in word, and unexpressed in recited creed, is not therefore irreligion. Far from it. For it was just qualities such as these which were the notable characteristics of the individuals who made up the primitive Christian communities; qualities which impressed their contemporaries, and silently but gradually transformed the moral outlook of society.

Who, however, were these men and women, these "atheists," as they were called by the upholders of the "established" religions of the Empire, who revealed Christian virtues to a decadent world? They came, like the majority, I suppose, of the men of our vast armies, from the poor, the oppressed, the submerged, in a word, from the huge slave population of Mediterranean lands. They revealed to what heights of morals, devotion, good faith, and self-abnegation the "lower orders" could rise, just as now our men have astonished those

belonging to higher levels of wealth, and opportunity, and privilege by their vast store of truly religious qualities—honour and humbleness, self-surrender and self-sacrifice, love of leaders and of comrades—unrevealed, unmeasured, and even unsuspected before.

Thus the summons of Christ and the call of the cause prove to be not dissimiliar either in themselves or in their effects; and the qualities which they evoke possess the same uniting and impelling powers. Nor are the conditions unlike. In spite of the Church—or, shall we say, because of its relative failure to draw and hold them—it is these very submerged multitudes, crushed in the drab, sordid, and narrow existence of often uncertain wage-earning, with its normally brief and exciting pleasures, who have, when the previous monotonous pressure has been released, exhibited this wondrous revelation of unity, unselfishness, endurance, and sacrifice. Just as of old time the poor, ill-treated and unprivileged of the slave-world of Rome, manifested the heroic missionary and martyr spirit, the unexampled love and mutual devotion of the first age at the magic summons of the glad-tidings of the Lord of life.

When one considers these phenomena so curiously similar displayed by the soldiers in the trenches, huts, and dug-outs of our armies now, and by the slaves in their halls, house-churches, and catacombs of a distant past, one realises very plainly that we have been accustomed to look too much to the external in religion, instead of seeking to create and to diffuse such conditions as are conducive to enabling the latent and inward heart of a man, the best in him, to come to expression. Like the new faith in the first century, this war in the twentieth has taught afresh those whose eyes are not blinded and ears not closed that Religion is more than, and may be quite different from, formal observance and public respectability, and that worship "in spirit and truth" may have but little connection with, say, "assisting" at mass, attendance at chapel-meeting, "Church-parade" of a regiment, or a warship "rigged" for

service. We see, in fact, in organised religious bodies, broadly speaking, *failure*, tinged at this crisis with remorse, albeit relieved here and there by the success, real or apparent, of over-heated effort and artificial stimulus to outward observance; and we are bound to contrast it with the genuine *flame*, that of untold devotedness in the trenches and in the workshops, and that of passionately and corporately inspired religion in the early communities of Christians.

But what of our brethren of the clergy? Some there are, indeed, to be accounted as flame, burning out their earthly lives in unstinting devotion for and with their people; some there are also marked with failure, saddened and broken in their inefficiency, who have relapsed into dull routine and lost the inspiration of the freshness of labour. Many acknowledge themselves depressed by the apparent unfruitfulness of their toil amid the unresting strain of town parishes; many confess to a vegetating slackness, having been, in the words of one, "too long with the bullocks." The majority form an intermediate class; often, alas, "rede-less," out of touch with the onward sweep of the stream of thought—intellectual, religious, social. Frequently they are without any far-seeing vision, limited to parochial interests; often fearing progress of any sort, content that no disturbing illumination should shine upon their congregations, and dreading to read books that might possibly be "unsound," according to the outlook of the school in which they have been nurtured.

There is undoubtedly a large measure of truth in the charge that the parsons are out of touch with the people. But oftentimes it is due to the system and to custom rather than to the men. For, generally speaking, organised religion only knows the toilers from the outside, although originally *they* were the Christians. Except for those who possess a singularly attractive personality and are gifted with tender and magnetic sympathy, the more part of the ministry, one may surmise, are not really familiar with the latent heart and the buried selflessness discoverable in the ordinary toiling masses. Nowadays

the common life, needs and dangers of the new armies and the urgent summons of the country's cause to work at unprecedented pressure have afforded them the long lacking opportunity for finding themselves, for bringing out their hidden best, for ardent self-expression in terms of daily experience rather than in the cold forms and stiff respectability of probably long relinquished church-going.

For we must concede that the workers have not been encouraged or helped to realise that the best in them in its exercise is essentially Christianity, and the outward worship, creed and communion but the sacraments and symbols thereof. The potent urge of collective peril and the effective stimulus of corporate toil have brought to the surface the elemental rudiments of Christian morals and religion, of true worth-ship. These were seldom evoked by the rote-knowledge which perhaps they were taught of the formulation of the religious experience of other people in the distant past, or by the "worship" which they probably at some time attended. And so death or wounds and common perils have proved more effective tutors than any traditional and formal exercises of religion. If they have not definitely brought the soldier and the toiler to Christ, they have at least, though it be unwittingly, stimulated into activity some fundamentally Christian virtues. The early disciples, brought face to face with fire or sword, torture or slavery, learned the same fact as our men and women at the present time before the supreme sacrifice or the threatened loss of all that they hold most dear, that in such experiences superficial conventions lose their importance and life's real values are discovered.

Again, many of us perceive now before our eyes other phenomena curiously parallel with those of the first century of our era. The conservative traditionalism of the organised churches tends to afford the most powerful hindrance to the progress of real religion. It was just the same in our Lord's day. The carefully punctilious high-churchmen of His time slew Him. The religious leaders and officials of His generation

strove to crush the infant Church of His disciples. So the question needs putting and facing: Are we of the ancient churches, organised parts of the whole Body of Christ, bringing about all unintentionally on a world-wide scale the same crime? In our jealousy for age-long, but now obsolescent, formularies and forms, in our anxious guardianship of the husk, are we losing the kernel? retaining the letter, are we missing the spirit? To any of prophetic vision this ghastly danger looms large and real. Are we Churchmen comforting ourselves in the midst of this wild upheaval of a world war with the cry "the old is good," when we know in our hearts that the Spirit of the Lord is summoning us insistently to use "fresh wine-skins" for the "new wine" of this untold ferment?

Ecclesiasticism led to the crime of Calvary. Ecclesiastical religion to-day, Catholic or Protestant in type, with its machinery of organisation, forms and discipline, and its historic past, bears a strange and terrifying likeness to that of the Jewish Church which was alike opposed by and antagonistic to our Lord. It is not impossible that the modern counterpart should go the way of the old Temple-system, and of those State-worships also, whose proud shell was politically buttressed up when their life had fled, until it too fell before the flame of the faith of the despised and persecuted Christians. Formal self-righteousness in corporate and individual religion seems sometimes little less obvious than in that first age, and dogmas and rites, "traditions of men," appear to possess more importance in the view of people presumably Christian than "justice and love and fidelity;" for while religion itself is passing through testing fires as yet unequalled, we solemnly discuss some trivial detail of doctrine or some posture of local ceremonial, we quibble while the world burns. And one is compelled to admit that there is more religion in laying down one's life for friends, country and cause, than in much conventional church-going. For in face of grim death some faith has to be thought out, although it may be veiled by a rough jest, or be incapable of any verbal expression.

The corrective applied by the Apostle to the partisan spirit at Corinth was loyalty to the one Lord, and *esprit de corps* in the fullest sense pervades company, brigade, army, to-day. There is one cause, one commander, and no place for party or for clique. Selflessness conquers selfishness; and that is just Christianity, although it is the basis of courage and of efficiency as well. Is there no lesson therefrom of corporate responsibility for our own Church? no warning from the past and the present too for those who strive, consciously or not, for party ascendancy, regardless of scientific truth or historic accuracy? It is men that count to-day, not views. The men pass, but the qualities which ennoble them, which befit the citizens of the heavenly Kingdom, do not change, although Churches may decay and Empires may fall.

So far I have refrained from saying aught about the National Mission, because each of us who is worth anything is "doing his bit" in helping to forward this spiritual movement within the Church of England. The extent of the Mission's nationalness only the future can disclose. But it is, at any rate, present among ourselves in varying degrees, and it depends entirely on its primary effectiveness within the Church which initiated it, whether it will bear any fruit in Christianising the public opinion and deepening the religion of the nation at large, and in this wise obviate, or at least check, a relapse from common ideals and high endeavours on the part of our fighting men, should they return to the old and unimproved environment, and to the trivial or sordid experience from which they had escaped.

Nevertheless, as long as the impulse remains restricted to *one* among the organised bodies of Christians in our midst, albeit theoretically and legally the "established" Church, it can scarcely be correctly termed "national." Furthermore, not a few laymen are found to declare that if our leaders claim to have some sort of revelation as to the manner of the Mission, they seem to be perilously near dictating to God the time thereof. But we must rather regard the autumn effort

as a commencement, a push, an enkindling. The history of religious progress warns us that the Spirit works in His own way, by His own agents, and in His own time, regardless of human plans or expectations. It may be so now. But the preparation will, at least, fit us for the call, if only we be found waiting upon God. This movement of Repentance and Hope is acknowledged to be a fresh start, an attempt to recover some of the lost ground of centuries; it is a frank admission of failure on the part of clergy and people who bear Christ's name. The ideal remains the same as ever, and that is the inclusion of all the individuals of the nation in His Church; but that federated fellowship is as yet but a grand vision to lure us on, and to render us heartily dissatisfied with our glaring shortcomings and our petty divisions.

The Gospel warning of companions and evangelists of Jesus being finally rejected and disowned rises before us, but we are no fatalists that we should sit down under the inevitable, rather with Cobden, if the Spirit of Christ inspire us, we desire at once to set about doing what is said to be impossible; and, with Huxley, refuse to regard as such aught that is conceivable. The failure of Christians, and so of English Churchmen as well, confronts us in this war, and in the conditions which preceded and produced it, and that failure furnishes "them them that are without" with a taunt. Our worth-ship has admittedly been disappointing. But the flame of devotion which fired the primitive communities of disciples surprised and aroused the admiration of the world, as does that which fires our fighting men just now. The human material has not changed its nature. The Power that is ready to inspire, strengthen and transfigure us, is neither different nor diminished. Enough then of fruitless and divided talk in convocation and in conference, of misdirected energies in church or parish. We confess in all humility that we need "a new spirit," but it will neither inflow nor indwell closed vessels. Go to: let us fall forthwith to prayer and thought and action; let us banish failure, let us fan the Divine flame.

THE CHURCH IN THE WARLIGHT.

By the Rev. Frederic Coxwell Young, B.A.,
Vicar of Sherburn-in-Elmet.

Two things particularly strike one about the Church at the present time, both of which have been underlined, italicised, written in red by the war.

(1) The insignificant position occupied by the Church in the Nation.

(2) The indifference of people in general, especially men, to the Church.

The way in which the Church is ignored, is all the more noticeable by contrast with her very exalted official position.

The Archbishop of Canterbury is the second subject in England. He crowns the sovereign; bishops sit in the House of Lords by virtue of their office. The harness is magnificent; it is the horse that has shrunk.

The Church ought to be the witness for righteousness in the country, but is she? Individual preachers may make, and often do make an impression, but they are individuals, they are not the Church. In this connection one is reminded of the paragraph, often to be seen in magazines and weeklies, "the editor is not responsible for the opinions expressed by his contributors."

The nation knows where to turn to in a financial difficulty—she turns to the business men. She knows where to turn to in times of epidemics—she turns to the medical profession. She knows where to turn to when relations with foreign powers are becoming strained—she turns to the navy and army; but when it is a question of what is right (as for instance whether a fight between a negro and a white man is desirable as a public show, or as to the morality of militancy), there is no one to turn to.

It may be objected, but when war broke out the nation did turn to the Church, and asked her to call the people to prayer.

Yes, a Church holding such a position as ours must be considered, it would never have done simply to ask the printers to produce forms of prayer; the right and proper thing to do was to ask the Church to produce them, which she did.

I do not say the Church is not considered, I say she is not consulted. The nation does not dream of turning to the Church for information about conduct. This seems to bring us a little farther.

On the one hand we find that the Church does not specialise in conduct. I think this is true. Perhaps it will be well to stop here for a moment.

Someone may say, "The business of the Church is to look after individuals, to convert and influence people one by one." That was the method of Jesus Christ, that is no doubt her chief work, and in this also she conspicuously fails.

But surely the Church is intended to be a visible witness to righteousness in her corporate capacity. When in modern times has the Church led any movement for good? Did the Church abolish slavery? Did she bring in the Factory Acts? Did she reform prisons? Did she ever try to understand the Socialists? Is she the leader of the Temperance Movement, or of Housing Reform? How many of her members have ever heard of the Peace Society?

I am sorry to use platitudes, and these are platitudes, but that a thing is a platitude does not necessarily hinder it from being true.

And secondly the average man, the man in the street, as he is called, does not take any interest in the Church. Now why is this?

It is a big question, but I think the answer to it may be summed up in the following sentence.

There is a feeling of unreality about the whole business.

But what is the cause, it may be asked, of this sense of unreality? Does the average man demand that everything

should be real? Does he, like Mr. Gradgrind, demand, "Facts, sir, Facts!" Has he no use for the imagination? Does he share with George II. a hatred of "Boetry" and "Bainting?" No, he is not necessarily that kind of man at all. Men who never dream of going to Church, buy, or at any rate borrow, poetry, still go to picture galleries, and still revel in the romances of Shakespeare and Stevenson. The difference is, that with the poet and the painter, you know where you are.

But religion is different. A man does not know where he is. Through the pages of the Bible fact and fiction wander hand in hand like Siamese twins, it is impossible to tell them apart. There is no saying which is which. From Genesis to Revelation runs a miraculous streak. Where does fact begin? To that question the clergy give every variety of answer. On the extreme right are still a few persons who accept all the miraculous as fact. On the extreme left are those persons who regard everything miraculous as fiction. In the centre is every variety of believer, joining the two extremes, who says concerning different parts of the Bible, This is Allegory, not History. This is Spiritual, not Literal. This is Interpolation. This is Corrupt. But *this*, THIS is fact. Where is the line to be drawn?

The Church (or rather I should say the clergy) are like a company of infantry who set out at sunrise for a route march. At daybreak *i.e.*, their ordination, they all fall in, the rest of the day is occupied in falling out.

Here, in the extreme rear, are those who are trying to carry the whole of their *impedimenta*.

Besides the XXXIX. Articles and the three Creeds, they are burdened with the literal interpretation of the whole authorised translation of the Bible. As we pass up the line, along a road both sides of which are strewn with miracles, we overtake at last the van, which is marching "light."

These still have their Bibles (shedding their leaves, like Vallombrosa oaks) still have the XXXIX. Articles, but painted

in natural colours to avoid notice, still have their Creeds which they tactically use as watchwords.

As a recruiting effort the march is not a success. Neither in the van nor in the rear does the appeal to "come and join us" meet with much response. To the rear the reply is, "How could I possibly carry all these things?" To the van the objection raised is, "How can I join a body which says it does believe what it says it does not believe?"

And so the average man is puzzled, he does not understand what it all means.

Is there any way out? Yes, I think there is.

First of all, what was the way in? What has been the cause of all this entanglement and confusion? The cause has been that the Church has mingled together as conditions of membership, two things which should be kept separate. These are Faith and Belief.

Faith has to do with the Heart and Will. Belief has to do with the Head.

What has been the strength and weakness of Christianity? The strength of Christianity has been that, from the time of Jesus Christ, it has attracted the best men and women in world.

There have always been some people in the world who want to be good, who want to be pure, who want to help the unfortunate, to punish the brutal, to leave the world better than they found it. These people have been attracted to Christianity because Christ represented to them the best they knew, and promised them strength to be better than they were. The weakness of the Christian Church lies in the fact that she has not been able to secure all these persons in her ranks. More especially is this the case at the present time. And why cannot the Christian Church get all these persons? Because of the conditions she enforces.

The Christian Church demands not only faith, but belief, *i.e.*, intellectual assent to various controversial propositions. *The trouble lies there.*

The Church demands as a condition of membership, the acceptance of a whole series of statements, which it is claimed are statements of fact, when, in reality, they are all of them in the crucible.

It appears to be a question of scholarship, and of various readings, of MSS., of palimpsests, of Ur-Marcus and Q, of A.B.C.D. and the Sinaitic, of Josephus and Pliny, of Tacitus and Justin Martyr.

Now that Sir William Ramsay has been to Asia Minor we know that St. Luke is not merely an Evangelist, but a historian.

I have the highest respect for all these gentlemen living or dead, but are they the guardians of the Christian Faith? Would it really be a blow to Christianity if it should be proved that St. Luke was not quite himself when he wrote the "we" sections of the Acts?

Defenders of traditional Christianity give one the impression of people who are always ready to die in the last ditch, but are always finding another ditch a little further back more convenient for the purpose. Having suffered very severely from the attacks of both history and science they have now dug themselves in in a fresh place. This is absolutely the last ditch.

It is called Religious Experience.

The new apologetic runs as follows:—"Apologetic arguments after all only touch the fringe of the matter, they may help to ward off the attacks of the unbeliever, but they do not produce belief. Man (they say) only believes by his own personal experience. Every man must acquire this for himself. Once he has got that, all these disputes about date and authorship, faction and fiction will not interest him at all. *He knows.*"

Now I do not question the sincerity of this class of apologists. I believe it to be perfectly credible that a man should have such an experience of Divine knowledge as that accorded to Dr. Dale, for instance, when he was preparing an Easter sermon, or experiences like those of some of the persons

mentioned in Professor William James' *Varieties of Religious Experience*, namely that they felt themselves in contact with an invisible Presence other than themselves. I do not think it necessary to explain such things away by saying that they are the effect of the conscious self coming into contact with the subliminal self. It seems quite reasonable to believe that such an experience is the effect of the self coming into contact with God.

But granting so much, this kind of apologetic has its limitations.

(1) This experience does not convince anybody but the actual recipient.

(2) Even for him it does not prove all the Articles of the Creed.

A man may have a consciousness of some Being outside himself of ineffable goodness, but this does not prove that Jesus Christ was born of the Virgin Mary. Such experiences may be, indeed are, unassailable by attacks from history or science; they may prove the truth of a spiritual Christianity, but it is hard to see how they prove the truth of our orthodox Christianity.

In plain English, Religious Experience is one thing, and certain of the assertions in the Creeds are another.

What then is the way out?

The way out is for men to group themselves together in a fresh way.

A man writes from the front:—"Honest men are getting together." This seems to strike the right note. The old way has been for men to group themselves together by their beliefs.

The new way will be for men to group themselves together by their faith.

Christians will be those who group themselves together on the side of righteousness. Their creed will be, "Keep innocency and take heed unto the thing that is right." No question of belief should hinder a man from joining this group. About the invisible world he should be free to think as he will.

The Church puts belief before conduct. Christ put conduct before belief.

"If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine." He puts conduct first. And this is in accordance with human experience.

But it will be said:—"If you take away the Creeds, all religion will become chaos. The Creeds are the pillars which support Christianity. Remove them, and the whole edifice will crumble."

And what of the Pillars? Are the Creeds really the Pillars of Christianity? They have venerable antiquity as befits a pillar, but do they support the Christian Faith? I doubt it.

Once upon a time the Mayor and Corporation of a certain town decided to build a Town Hall. An architect was called in who provided one entirely suitable, but it had one defect. The Mayor and Corporation could not see how the roof was supported. They required pillars. In vain the architect protested. But the Mayor and Corporation were obstinate, pillars there must be, so pillars were built. But the architect was obstinate too, and he left a space, where a man might put his hand between the pillars and the roof.

The Mayor and Corporation required pillars. The roof didn't.

And does Christ's Church need pillars to support it as Dagon's Temple did? Is it not rather true to say? Christ's Church is supported by the Holy Spirit breathing in the lives of Christian men.

REVIEW.

THE CREED OF A CHURCHMAN.[1]

The association of ideas is so universal a factor in thinking that it is difficult not to take this excellent handbook in connection with the Bishop of Oxford's *Religion of the Church*;[2] and it is by a fortunate, if an undesigned, coincidence that the two books should have been published so nearly at the same time. For the second title of the latter work—*i.e.*, *A Manual of Membership*—strikes a note of authority: "We are they that ought to speak." The claim is not one that can be admitted; a demurrer must be entered. The term "Church" is ambiguous. But "The Religion of the Church" is certainly not "A Manual of Membership" of the Church of England; and membership of the Church Party is a smaller, a very much smaller, thing than membership of the National Church. *The Creed of a Churchman* is a demonstration that this is so—the more effectual because the book has no suggestion of controversy; and its joint authors, among whose names that of the Bishop of Peterborough stands first, are to be congratulated both on the opportuneness and the quality of their work.

Throughout its spirit is that of piety. It looks to the inward, not the outward; it does not dictate or argue, it persuades. The keynote is given in the opening words: "Christianity is an attitude towards life, and a way of living it." Were this borne in mind, how many difficulties would disappear!

> "Other information about God, the world and himself man can in some measure find out by the powers which God has given him. But, for Christianity, all that is so much background. The universe is just the staging for man; and the part of man's drama with which Christianity is concerned is his relations with God."

His one attitude towards God is that of "willing dependence;" and "for this willing dependence, the Scriptural name in Faith."

This is the substance of the story of the Fall, which—

> "is so penetratingly true to the innermost facts of human nature that its inspiration is even more obvious, if it be taken as allegory, than it would be if it were literal narrative."

The problem of evil with which it leaves us face to face is as a rule approached from the wrong side. What should be emphasized in it is "the wonderful way in which God is always and from all points countering evil;" there is a principle of compensation at work, and at work successfully, in men and in things.

The standpoint of the book is that of religious experience; beliefs and institutions alike are regarded from this side, so that dogma is not discharged at us as from a catapult—a missile whose impact tears or rends us, and which remains a foreign and unassimilated body in the mind. Rather it is

[1] By the Bishop of Peterborough, the Bishop of Barrow-in-Furness, Cyril C. B. Bardsley, E. A. Burroughs, and Edward S. Woods. Longmans, 1917. 1/-.

[2] A. R. Mowbray & Co., 1916.

elicited from within, and shown to be already present (even if unrecognized) in its essential features. "What ye worship in ignorance, this set I forth unto you:" this is the treatment given to the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement; everywhere it is the pastor, not the divine or the ecclesiastic, who speaks. So that the message delivered is a Gospel, not a formula or a polity—a thing within, not without, consciousness. Its presentation is often singularly felicitous.

> "Despite the witness of the New Testament, and the occasional efforts in Christian history to re-affirm this truth, it would still seem to be imperfectly grasped by Christians generally that a conscious experience of forgiveness is a thing belonging to the very foundation of the Christian life. . . . . To doubt the certainty of my forgiveness is to slight the love of God and make the cross of Christ of none effect. Here is the very bed-rock of the spiritual life"—

and the cornerstone of Evangelical religion.

The outstanding gains of the Reformation are summarized (p. 25) as—(1) Direct access to God; (2) the overcoming of the sharp distinction drawn in the Medieval Church between the religious and the secular; (3) the permission and encouragement of learning and research. These points might have been developed and emphasized. The Reformation, as Paley well put it, "exonerated Christianity of a weight which sunk it. If indolence or timidity had checked these exertions (*i.e.*, those of the Reformers), or suppressed the fruit and publication of mere enquiries, is it too much to affirm that infidelity would at this day have been universal?" The comment (p. 29) on the *Via Media* of Anglicanism is just. "Middle paths are always difficult to tread with enthusiasm. But, in spite of an undoubted leaning to excessive sobriety and caution, the wisdom of her choice—that of the Church of England—has never been more evident than in the twentieth century." As a matter of fact, this is so; from the point of view of piety, in particular, which is rightly prominent in this handbook, the avoidance of a sharp break with the past which characterized the Tudor settlement of religion has become, what it was not in the beginning, a source of strength. It is important, however, to avoid language calculated to give the impression that this *Via Media* was adopted from theological motives, or that it commended itself to the Church of the time. Neither was the case; and the writers have not succeeded in avoiding a certain ambiguity in the matter. The old, or Marian, bishops would have nothing to do with the Elizabethan Church; the new, with few exceptions, would have gone further in the direction of change. The original or birth sin, if sin it be, of the Anglican compromise is Erastianism. It is to the State, not to the Church, that we owe all that distinguishes us from continental Protestants; our English "Interim" was imposed for political reasons by the civil power upon the spiritual. The aim of the Government was to maintain the religious unity of the country, which was then a condition of public security. Had either a Papal or a Puritan Church Establishment been set up, the rival factions would have been at one another's throats. The *Via Media* tided the country over a critical period: for the time being it made it possible for Catholics who would dispense with the Pope—who did not bulk as large in the Catholicism of the

16th century as in that of to-day—and Protestants who could tolerate certain survivals of the old ritual which so radical a reformer as Calvin described as *tolerabiles ineptiae*, to dwell together, if not in unity, at least without open strife. But the Church had very little to say in the matter; the Government alternately forced or checked the pace. These considerations, important in themselves, are even more so in their implications; they enable us to "place" the English Church.

Of all the Reformed Churches, this Church is, in Dryden's famous phrase, the "least reformed." But she stands, historically and theologically, on the side of the Reformation. Materially, she has retained the ministry in its historical shape. Nothing took place in the 16th century to break any succession which may have existed in the Medieval Church, or to affect any religious values which may have attached to such a succession; the Roman Catholic polemic against what are called "Anglican Orders" will convince only those who are convinced, or willing to be convinced, of the Roman position on other grounds. But, let theologians theorize as they will, our ecclesiastical polity is based historically on expediency rather than on principle; and the best English mind judges, with Selden, that "they are equally mad who say bishops are so *jure divino* that they must be continued; and they who say, they are so anti-christian that they must be put away. All is as the State likes."[1]

The suggestions offered (p. 43) for the future are far-reaching. (1) Practical Churchmen, it appears, are bent on the increase of the Episcopate; though, should the experiment be tried and fail, opinion would probably set in the opposite direction. More bishops do not necessarily mean more efficiency or more religion. In what were once the Papal States and the Kingdom of Naples, bishops are as plentiful as blackberries; but religion is less flourishing than in France, where, as with ourselves, they are few. (2) It may be held reasonably that "the bishop's autocracy" is better limited by the law than by "government in consultation with his council of presbyters." It was precisely in order to avoid the dissension and weakness of action caused by this system that what is known as the "Monarchial" Episcopate came to prevail. The case was one of the survival of the fittest; one man rule was found to work better, and the episcopate "in commission" disappeared. (3) The recognition of the work of women in the Church bids fair to become a condition of the survival of the Churches; and the writers do well to insist upon it. In a time when institutional religion is losing its hold not only on the masses of the population, but of those sections of it which a generation ago were its keenest supporters, it is suicidal to leave untapped the accumulations of zeal and capacity which are locked up in "the devout female sex." "Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy;" in spiritual gifts the sex distinction does not apply.

It will appear to many that the writers have fallen into a trap in taking for granted a recent Resolution of the Lower House of the Convocation of the Southern Province, to the effect that "no arrangements for worship should be regarded as satisfactory which do not provide for a Celebration of the Holy Communion as the principal Sunday service, at an hour

[1] *Table Talk*—viii.

when the greatest number can be expected to communicate." The words bristle with equivocations, and inconsistencies. The Eucharist is indeed a social bond; and that it should be restored to its proper position as a corporate, or community, act is much to be desired. But this was not the idea underlying the Resolution; and the stress laid by the great majority of its advocates on fasting reception makes the last clause (to which the writers of this handbook naturally give prominence) a contradiction in terms. The change in our public worship proposed is revolutionary; it goes back upon the Reformation usage established among us for more than 300 years; and separates (as it is intended to separate) those who adopt it from the universal practice of the Reformed Churches. The snare is, or should be, too obvious to deceive. The *consensus* of opinion that our Morning Service, as it stands, is unsatisfactory must not lead us to repair one error by another and a greater. The substitution of "Mass for Mattins" is bad history and bad theology. For us, in particular, it would be a new patch on an old garment; a practice radically inconsistent both with the formularies and the spirit of the English Church.

The futility of a policy of compromise, where principles are at stake, is illustrated opportunely by the review of this work in the *Church Times* of February 9th. While it is welcomed as "an evidence of the general tendency of the new Evangelicalism towards a candid levelling up and escape from onesidedness," the work is described as "Churchmanship *juxta modum*." "There is something *aqueous* about these pages;" and "we must gravely describe as sophistical—the old word was Jesuitical—the new Evangelical treatment of the express doctrine of the New Testament, of the Universal Church, and of the English Prayerbook and Ordinals, about the power of remitting and retaining sins. It is neither honest nor scholarly nor intelligent." Perhaps the *Church Times* is not a very good judge of these qualities. But there is something to be said for the view that it would be better to say frankly that the two theologies differ fundamentally; that a man must choose between them; and that the fitter of the two will survive and prevail.

ALFRED FAWKES.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION NEWS.

Bristol Branch.—The following resolution was passed at a recent meeting of the Committee of the Bristol Branch of the Churchmen's Union, and forwarded to the Bishops of Bath and Wells, and of Bristol:—

> "The Committee of the Bristol Branch of the Churchmen's Union desires to assure the Bishop of Bath and the Bishop of Bristol of its respectful and grateful appreciation of their Lordships' readiness to meet the friendly suggestion of Dr. Arnold Thomas that Mr. Gamble should deliver an address at Highbury on a recent Sunday evening.
>
> "And the Committee ventures to believe that such a spirit, manifested by those in authority in our own and other parts of the Church of Christ, will best promote the true ideal of Christian fellowship,

which (in the words of the Bishops assembled at Lambeth in 1908) is not compromise, but comprehension, not uniformity, but unity."

South Essex Branch.—The fifth meeting of this branch was held at the Chaplaincy, Hornchurch, by the kind invitation of the Rev. Herbert and Mrs. Dale, on January 27th, at 3-15.

The Rev. M. W. Manthorpe gave a very stimulating address on "The Place of the Bible in the Religion of the 20th Century." Agreeing with the most old-fashioned Protestant that the better known the Bible is, the purer and livelier our religion is likely to be, the lecturer advocated, on that very account, whole-hearted acceptance of critical principles combined with faith in the Scriptures as containing a Divine Revelation, but with full recognition of the human element as well as the Divine in them. The supreme need is not a revised Psalter and Lectionary (necessary as these are), but a *revised point of view*. The Bible must be viewed in proper focus, with all its parts seen in due proportion, the records of the life of Christ being of paramount importance. Moreover, criticism must be more affirmative and constructive. If this better point of view is to be obtained, help must be given (1) in our schools, (2) from our pulpits.

The paper was followed by an interesting discussion, in which it was suggested that sermons might with advantage be given more frequently in series. The meeting also endorsed the appeal of the lecturer for short practical commentaries suitable for the busy layman.

Manchester Branch.—A meeting of this branch was held in the Onward Buildings, Deansgate, at 5 p.m. on Wednesday, January 31st, Professor M. A. Canney being in the chair. A paper was read by the Rev. A. J. Humphreys, Vicar of St. Paul's, Accrington, entitled "The Spirit in the Church." *Ubi spiritus, ibi ecclesia* was the burden of Mr. Humphrey's remarks, and he observed that "an embodiment of the Holy Ghost" might perhaps replace "an extension of the Incarnation" as a descriptive formula of the Church's essence. Mr. Humphreys went on to deprecate that ill-founded faith in machinery and organisation *as such*, which is so common in clerical circles. The one legitimate criterion was not historical antiquity but the fruits of spiritual life. These "fruits of the Spirit" were described by Mr. Humphreys at some length; the insight of prophecy, the generosity of love, the tolerance of charity, were to be included among them.

Wherever this spirit was present, there would always be absent the chief barrier to the re-union of the Churches. As things were, a rigid and mechanical view of the Spirit's presence and operation had become the most serious obstacle to that ideal.

Our conception of the Church and of its vital spiritual force needed to be reconciled with the facts of religious experience. No amicable platitudes about "uncovenanted grace," would serve to patch the tattered garment of

a discredited theory. What was needed was a new science of the Church, to reduce this chaos of facts to order—a new theory to account for the presence of the Spirit where (according to the old theory) it should have been absent; and (what is even more serious) to account for its *absence* where it should have been present. Growth, experiment, adaptation must replace ossification, conservatism, and immobility. Men must recognise that while the Spirit remains, its agencies and vehicles may (and must) change, with the mental atmosphere of succeeding generations.

Some discussion followed in which appreciation was expressed of the principles expounded by the reader of the paper.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE LATE MISS YOUNGHUSBAND.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

I should like, if you will allow me, to record my gratitude, and, I believe, the gratitude of others, for the personal influence at our Council Meetings of the late Miss Younghusband. This gentle lady, bearing the burden of her partial blindness so patiently, pursuing her religious ideals so nobly, serving our Union with such a grand, humble, unfailing perseverance—this lady did us all more good, perhaps, than we know. I look back, touched and rebuked, at some conversations with her. Among us liberal Churchmen, characters like that are beyond price. *Vere magnus est, qui magnam habet caritatem. Vere benedictus est, qui Dei voluntatem facit.*

January 11th, 1917. A MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL.

P.S.—Through my mistake in the date the above humble tribute missed the January number.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHBISHOPS' COMMITTEE ON CHURCH AND STATE.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMEN.

We shall greatly miss the late Dean of Ripon in our discussion of the above-named Report. Is there anyone quite to take his place?

The Committee was asked to inquire how two things could be secured.

(1) A fuller expression of the spiritual independence of the Church;

(2) A fuller expression of the national recognition of religion.

Their minds seem to have been entirely occupied with (1), and so are the minds of all who comment favourably on the Report.

In the changes recommended in the relations of the State to the Church the only thing kept in view, apparently, was the negative one of removing what hindered the independence of the Church. Dr. Fremantle would have thought (2) the more important of the two aims. He would not have allowed it to be ignored that there was loss to be made up in some other way as well as gain to be rejoiced in in altering the relations of Parliament to

legislation touching the National Church. He would have reminded us that Parliament, however absurd theoretically, and unfit practically as the body which should frame the Church's laws, had sometimes given better expression to the national religion than the Church was prepared to support; had carried measures more in accordance with the real spirit of Christianity than those the Church was interested in. He would have had something positive to suggest to strengthen that side of the Report which was supposed to deal with aim (2). I think he would have tried to secure a reconsideration of the rule by which members of all other religious communions are excluded from voting at elections to Parochial and Ruri-Decanal Councils and Conferences, unless they happen to be actual communicants in the Church of England.

I say "happen," because it depends so much on mere circumstances, and the particular parish in which they are living. Dr. Fremantle would, I think, have urged that if we were going to decrease the power of Parliament in these matters, and increase that of the Church, we ought somehow to open the way for an enlargement of the active membership of the Church, and to take care that in making it more real we did not make it more rigid.

We have to consider that it is not only a matter for regret but for much heartsearching, and perhaps for shame, that we have so managed matters for the last four centuries as to make our terms of communion exclude an increasing number of those who truly and loyally love our Lord, and without whose help we cannot give full expression to the national recognition of religion. It is also probably true that the dangers the rule in question was framed to guard against are much less real than they were a few years ago.

As to Statutory Parochial Councils, it is well-known that the late Dean was most keen about them and thought them the reform most urgently required. His views as to their details are probably known.

Perhaps you, Sir, may be able to give us some information about them. I imagine they would meet some of the points raised by H. F. Walker this month in your Correspondence column. It certainly seems that under the scheme of the Report much more is taken away from the powers of Churchwardens, about which there has been no complaint, than from the autocracy of the Parson, which has so constantly been condemned even by themselves.

Bulmer Rectory, York, HENRY LAURENCE.
January 29th, 1917.

[We are in full agreement with our correspondent. What is needed is re-establishment of the Church on a much more liberal and comprehensive basis, and we venture to think that if religious and patriotic Nonconformists knew their own business that is what they would aim at rather than at the Disestablishment, Disendowment, and Disruption of the National Church.—ED. *M.C.*]

THE COMPARATIVE STUDY OF RELIGION.

SIR, TO THE EDITOR OF *The Modern Churchman.*

With the support of His Highness the Maharaja of Baroda, we have been able to establish here a "Seminar for the Comparative Study of

Religion." The purpose of the Seminar is, as stated in the prospectus, "the comparative study of religions according to scientific methods and as pure research. It is to concern itself with facts, and does not set out with any purpose of apologetic defence or destructive criticism of religion in general or of any individual religion." Some Research Fellowships have been founded in connection with the Seminar, and it is further hoped to make the Seminar a means for the organisation of researches in subjects relating to religion or religions, which are now being pursued by scholars in different parts of the world. All who are engaged on such researches are therefore requested to send their names, addresses, and the subjects of their enquiries to the undersigned. A list will be formed, and those occupied with the same or allied subjects put into communication one with another. At a later date it may be possible to establish other means of co-operation, but the formation of this list is the first necessary step. The above applies to any branch of research relating to religions, whether Christian or non-Christian.

Baroda, India,
November, 1916.

ALBAN G. WIDGERY,
Director of the Seminar.

[Professor Widgery, it will be remembered, was a member of the Council of the Churchmen's Union until his departure for India. His seminar will commend itself as worthy of support to those who believe in the value of the scientific method in religious studies. In the Prospectus which accompanied the letter, Professor Widgery writes—"Enlightened believers of all creeds ought to desire that their religion shall be studied by methods of comparison with other religions." Certainly no liberal Christian will feel that the religion of Christ has anything to fear from such a study.—ED. *M.C.*]

THE TASK OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY REFORMERS.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

Allow me space for a few words on Mr. Iredell's letter in your January number. I need not say anything about its tone and style. Had Mr. Iredell read my letter with greater care, he would have seen that it is submitted to those who are interested in the future of Christianity, as a whole, and not of a party. I certainly do not hope for progress from the Catholics, because their intellectual movement is only retrograde.

Among the reformed Churches called Protestant there is more hope. Grateful as they should be to the Reformation of the 16th century, they may now see that in consequence of our increased knowledge, especially of the early Churches, and the general criticisms and rejection of the traditional dogmas, it is time for a further reform to bring us nearer to the teaching of Jesus.

JOHN S. DAWES, D.D.
11, *Grove Road, Surbiton, Surrey.*

[We hope for much from both Liberal Protestants and Liberal Catholics if they can be got to understand each other, and to co-operate with good-will.—ED. *M.C.*]

THE TASK OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY REFORMERS.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

Liberal principles, as you rightly observe in your last issue, involve giving a hearing to all sides of a question. I therefore do not follow Mr. Iredell in the part of his letter where he objects to the publication of Dr. Dawes' letter. But I am quite with him in thinking that Dr. Dawes' programme will not do as it stands. Our function is primarily to re-interpret our spiritual heritage. It would be disastrous were we to repeat the common mistake of reformers, that of throwing away gold along with the dust. Confession, for example, on the lines indicated in our Prayer-book is, as I can testify, extremely valuable in the spiritual life; and the other points mentioned by Dr. Dawes in the first part of his programme need a treatment more reverent and discriminating than is implied in the words "destructive and combative." The second part of Dr. Dawes' programme is more acceptable. I presume that "our neighbour" does not stop at humanity, but includes the sentient creation.

H. NORTHCOTE.

Boulogne-sur-mer,
Jan. 25th, 1917.

ARE CATHOLICS UNETHICAL?

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

The *Modern Churchman* claims to be liberal, and on the whole does seem to want to be fair to "Catholics" as well as to "Protestants." Nevertheless, in the criticism of Catholics which, from time to time, figures in these pages, there often appears to me to be an insinuation that they are the unethical party in the Church while the Liberals are the ethical ones.

Now, in practice, is this so? Suppose oneself to live in a parish presided over by a Catholic and to want to live an unethical life, attending services and posing as a "good Churchman." Would one have a happy time of it? Sunday by Sunday one would have the Vicar telling one to go confession. One would have thrust into one's hands books containing self-examination papers, in which all one's business sins and private sins and home sins would be laid bare with an intimation that one had better ask oneself if one had fallen into any of them since one's last communion, and, if so, one should not come to the Holy Table again until one had put them away.

Looking at it from a broader social point of view, one would probably find the Vicar a vigorous member of the Christian Social Union or the Church Socialist League, and telling one in his sermons that to come to Church and then go home to sweat one's employees, or to squeeze unjust rents out of one's tenants, was "bunkum" of a very dangerous character.

For the sake of a quiet life one would perhaps take refuge in the nearest Cathedral, where a Liberal Canon would regale one with the latest reasons for disbelieving the Creed, or a Protestant prophet would assure one that the real danger to the spread of Christianity was the number of candles lit in some Churches, or the number of people who play golf on Sunday.

Honestly, if I wanted to be a "ritualist," in the sense of a man who has a form of godliness while denying the power thereof, I should keep well out of the way of these stupid, unethical "Catholics."

Birmingham. JAMES ADDERLEY.

[P.S.—We have tried to answer Canon Adderley's question on p. 505 of this issue. There are Catholics and Catholics, and some, like our correspondent, are ethical Catholics, and some are not.—ED. *M.C.*]

A PROTEST.

SIR, *To the Editor of the* MODERN CHURCHMAN.

May I venture in the name of Christian love to protest against Father Kelly's remark as quoted in the *English Church Review* for January, p. 5, "That the Church of England is being taught to believe herself to be a number of piously nice people."

I cannot say that "piously nice people" appeal especially to me, but surely it is better to be "piously nice" than to be vicious, spiteful, worldly, and lazy.

Is it not time that Christians left off this silly fault-finding? In the same strain Father Kelly goes on to say that "he has yawned and sighed over modern undenominational Protestant humanism" (nearly as jaw-breaking as mediaeval sectarian Romanistic Catholicism) "for years in the big tent at Swanick."

After all, though, Protestant "religious piety and feeling" do not appeal to Father Kelly, these elements in religious worship may be as genuine and produce as good lives as Father Kelly's love of the Mass.

Bigoted Protestants are indeed trying, but so, I fear, are bigoted Catholics.

Is the world to be converted by Christians slighting each other? Is the saying "See how these Christians love one another" to be changed into, "See how these Catholics ignore the union of love in Christ, misunderstanding the Christ, they worship, through slights to His friends." For all Christians who love the Christ and strive to imitate His life are His friends.

Surely the awful war that is raging ought to unite Christians and make them ashamed of their own war. Let us unite like the Allies, sinking their separate nationalities in fighting for a great cause; let us, Christians, sink our differences in the war against evil, and unite in the greater union of love for our Lord.

FLORENCE NEVILL.

CLERICAL PROFESSIONALISM.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

The entertaining article and extract in the last number of the *Modern Churchman*, upon the decline of professionalism, and with it of the professional manner, in the clergy, calls up memories of Penley, the actor, and Chevalier, the caricaturist. It was, I think, Father Dolling who used to say how right Chevalier was. May it not, however, be said with truth that the pendulum

has now begun to swing, and the law of reaction to work against the clerical manner of the "private secretarial" type? Now-a-days the cleric who, for instance, puts on a specially religious or self-denying face, while standing on the platform of the railway station or as he walks, with clasped hands, from the vestry to the church, is, I fancy, becoming rather scarce. (This was true even before the war). It is, I think, with a different, and in fact a strongly *anti* private secretarial manner that the long-suffering laity will have to contend next, *i.e.*, as to the younger clergy. Are we not now becoming familiar with the brushed-up, aggressive and somewhat hustling type of young cleric, who, with rigid countenance, and without even looking at his companions in travel, or letting fall a single word, barges in and out of the railway carriage, bumps against you, and almost kicks your defenceless ankles as he passes. The "standard" manner is, in fact, changing from an effeminate namby-pamby to a harsh and pseudo-virile type. The new manner appears to cry aloud (and quite unnecessarily) "Yes! I am a parson right enough: moreover I dress as a parson—but (*n.b.*) it is possible, after all, to be a parson, and an out-and-out parson, and yet somehow not be an ass." Now this kind of thing is, of course, quite as ridiculous and self-conscious as the other, and every bit as irritating and inartistic. But I will hardly venture to enlarge upon the contrast, beyond merely suggesting that the new is simply the old with a new face. A generation and more ago young clergymen would, in many cases, set themselves to try and be like Charles Kingsley—and how silly and second-hand it was! The right manner is, of course, no manner—which (need I insist?) is not the same thing as no manners. Ridicule, after all, is a merely negative thing, and cannot reasonably be expected to cure the evil radically. Something deeper and more positive and helpful is required. That something it may be one of the functions of the "Modern Churchman" to help to bring.

MIDDLE-AGED PARSON.

THE PRESENT DISCONTENT.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

In his letter with this title "A Layman" writes: "People drop off gradually and unnoticed from the Church . . . . there is a dumb discontent." How glad some of us would be to come across discontent and "healthy fermentation!" In country districts, at any rate, we find mostly indifference, and very often strong objection to any teaching on modern lines. "It's the old-time religion, and it's good enough for me;" this is exactly the attitude of many congregations. In the *Interpreter*, vol. iii., p. 195, you, Sir, gave some valuable suggestions on "The treatment of dogma in our teaching and preaching," but it is my experience that even on those lines such sermons are much disliked. Let me quote a few criticisms: "If only our Vicar would preach the Gospel he would do much more good;" Our Vicar, you know, is a Radical,"—and this in our district is almost equivalent to being an Atheist; "Why don't you resign your orders if you don't believe what you once said you did believe?" Yet how careful I have been to be constructive and not destructive.

Among the ordinary Church-going people the burden of spreading religious truth in harmony with modern scientific and religious thought rests on the parochial clergy, but how often do we find ourselves up against the innate conservatism of the English Churchman. But in many parishes there are those who, though quite friendly with their clergyman, very seldom attend a place of worhip. The services do not appeal to them. Shall we "turn to the Gentiles?" Shall we give up some of our usual activities, and try to form, say, a branch of the Adult School Union, or a "Fellowship" Meeting, or a Brotherhood League? Would the ecclesiastical authorities frown on such an effort as not being "definite Church work?" It would be interesting to know if any such effort has been made in any Parish, and if so, what was the result.

A COUNTRY VICAR.

[By the same mail as the above letter we received another from a strong Liberal Vicar saying that the attendance at his evening services was so great that many could not find standing room. This is in a town, and there people are more open-minded.

We know of one case where an incumbent asked his bishop whether he would consent, there being no school house in the parish, to the parish church being used for classes of the Adult School Union, and the bishop replied that he could not consent, as it was illegal. We are glad when our bishops, as in the recent action of the Bishop of London, to which Dean Henson has referred, are brave enough to put Christian love and practical usefulness before meticulous legality.—ED. *M.C.*]

FINANCING THE MANUALS.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

My modest offer to subscribe £10 if nineteen others will do the same in order to help in financing the publication of the Manuals has elicited sufficient support to make it desirable to extend the time till 31st March.

There is a demand to-day for the support of spiritual as well as of material necessities. While we must all do our duty as far as possible to the State, I think there are some who may perhaps also be ready to make some pecuniary sacrifice in aid of this new serious call.

The following have already sent in their names as co-guarantors:—Rev. J. Gamble, Professor Gardner, Mr. W. B. Gordon, Rev. H. D. A. Major, the Master of Marlborough, the Misses Maude, Mr. Llewelyn Preece, Sir Richard Stapley, Rev. C. R. Shaw-Stewart, each £10. The Rev. A. E. Burdekin has promised £5, Sir T. C. Dyke-Acland, Bt., has sent a like sum. This makes £110 in all. Ten more guarantors of £10 each are required. I earnestly hope the remaining funds will be forthcoming.

9, *Regent Parade*, *Harrogate.* P. H. BAGENAL.

[We give some particulars of the Manuals Scheme on p. 511 of this issue. We wish to commend it heartily to our readers' support and good-will.—ED. *M.C.*]

*** The Editor regrets that limitations of space have prevented the publication of a number of letters.